



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "*Act*"), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 12, 2015, the landlord placed the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding in the mailbox of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord, who is not the applicant, on September 30, 2013, and the tenant on October 10, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$950.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on October 01, 2013;

- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated June 02, 2015, and personally handed to the tenant on June 02, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of June 12, 2015, for \$950.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to the tenant at 11:00 a.m. on June 02, 2015. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on June 02, 2015.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per subsections 89 (1) and (2) of the *Act* which permit service by;

- Leaving a copy with the person;
- By sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides;
- By leaving a copy with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant; and
- By attaching a copy to the door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by leaving it in the mailbox of the rental unit, which is not a method of service that is in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

Since I find that the landlord has not served the tenant with notice of this application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

I further find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement does not match the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution, the 10 Day Notice or any

other documentation submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution. There is also no documentation referring to the transfer of responsibilities from the landlord named on the residential tenancy agreement to the landlord applying for dispute resolution.

As the Direct Request process is an ex parte proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. The onus is on the landlord to present evidentiary material that does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding.

If the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding was served in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I would still have to dismiss to a hearing unless documentation was presented showing the transfer of management responsibilities from the previous landlord to the current landlord.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application, with leave to reapply.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: June 18, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

